

Application No.: 10/659,133  
Amendment dated: April 28, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated: January 28, 2005

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-13 and 18-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 2, 11, and 18 have been amended.

Claims 1-8, 11-13, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,644,753 to Ebrahim et al. (hereinafter “Ebrahim”). Claims 9-10 are objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in an independent form.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 2-8, 11, 13, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ebrahim. Ebrahim discloses a multiprocessor computer system having data processors and a main memory coupled to a system controller (See Abstract). Claims 1, 12, and 19 have been cancelled.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ebrahim fails to teach or suggest access to the elements of the resource by the first and second components is controlled based on the first mask value, as claimed in claims 2, 11, and 18 as amended. For example, Ebrahim states:

Cache Index Mask (CIM) field 194 specifies the number of Etag block entries or lines in the coherent cache, if any, of the corresponding UPA port. This indicates to the System Controller how many low order address bit of the physical address PA{40:6] to use for address compares for implementing the cache coherence protocol. This field is valid only for cache master UPA ports.

(Ebrahim, col. 22, lines 36-44).

In other words, Ebrahim describes a cache index mask (CIM) used to specify number of Etag block entries or lines in the coherent cache, making no mention of whether the CIM controls

Application No.: 10/659,133  
Amendment dated: April 28, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated: January 28, 2005

access to the elements. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that elements of claim 2, 11, and 18 are neither shown nor suggested by the cited reference. Claims 3-10, 13, and 20 depend from claims 2, 11, and 18, respectively. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-8, 11, 13, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

**Request for Allowance**

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to  
Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: April 28, 2005

By:



Stephen T. Neal  
(Reg. No. 47,815)  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON  
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500  
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501